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CGIAR is a global partnership that unites organizations engaged in research for a food-secure future. The CGIAR Research Program on Livestock provides research-based solutions to help smallholder farmers, pastoralists and agro-pastoralists transition to sustainable, resilient livelihoods and to productive enterprises that will help feed future generations. It aims to increase the productivity of livestock agri-food systems in sustainable ways, making meat, milk and eggs more available and affordable across the developing world. The Program brings together five core partners: the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) with a mandate on livestock; the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), which works on forages; the International Center for Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), which works on small ruminants and dryland systems; the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) with expertise particularly in animal health and genetics and the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) which connects research into development and innovation and scaling processes.

The Program thanks all donors and organizations who globally supported its work through their contributions to the [**CGIAR system**](http://www.cgiar.org/about-us/our-funders/)
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**Independent Steering Committee of the Livestock Agri-Food Systems   
CGIAR Research Program (ISC-CRP)**

**Report on the 1st Meeting. ILRI, Nairobi, 12-14 December 2017**

1. **Introduction**

The goal of the Livestock Agri-Food Systems CRP is to create a well-nourished, equitable and environmentally healthy world through livestock research for development. The CRP runs from 2017 to 2022 and addresses five interacting areas:

* Livestock Genetics
* Livestock Health
* Livestock Feeds and Forages
* Livestock and the Environment
* Livestock Livelihoods and Agri-Food Systems

These interacting areas are organized in Flagships. The Flagships are independent parts of the CRPs with own budgets and management structures.

The CRP specifically addresses important crosscutting issues, such as

* Gender and youth
* Capacity Development
* Monitoring and Evaluation

1. **Terms of Reference**

The Independent Steering Committee (ISC), with a high level of expertise, inclusiveness and independence, provides expert advisory support and guidance to the CGIAR Research Program on Livestock (Livestock CRP) and to the ILRI Board: In Summary the ISC is:

* Providing strategic direction and independent advice to the program
* Reviewing the Program of Work and Budget (POWB) prepared by the Flagship Leaders and the Program Management Committee (PMC), and providing a report to the ILRI Board
* Monitoring whether flagships and the CRP are achieving reasonable progress towards the agreed outputs and outcomes, including reviewing the draft Annual Report
* Overseeing external evaluations of the program, its Flagships and specific sets of activities.
* Advising on the CRP’s proposed schedule of CRP-Commissioned External Evaluations (CCEE)
* Participating on the evaluation reference group of each CCEE and Independent External Evaluation
* Advising the ILRI Board on the CRP and ILRI management response to the evaluation report
* Maintaining awareness of stakeholder perspectives and needs in the implementation of the CRP
* Providing a report summarizing findings and recommendations after each meeting, submitted to the CRP management and shared with the ILRI management and ILRI Board Program Committee. The ISC chair will participate in one meeting of the ILRI Board Program Committee each year, in person or virtually, for the agenda item on the CRP
* Serving as an expert resource to the program and the senior management team

Through their networks, the ISC is also expected to provide additional opportunities for the program, particularly with respect to new and strategic partnerships and for resource mobilization.

The ISC endorses these Terms of Reference and emphasizes the advisory function of the ISC to both CRP and ILRI management as well as to the research TEAMS. Therefore, for time being to ensure its independence, the ISC will not directly participate operational meetings of the Flagships as for instance in the annual planning workshops.

**Observations of the meeting:**

1. We agree with the present terms of reference but if the need for changes becomes apparent over time, we will engage with CRP Management regarding such changes.
2. We strongly support that the role of the ISC is an advisory role but accept the need (at the moment) for the term ‘steering’ to be included in the title.
3. **ISC Members**

The current members of the Independent Steering Committee (ISC) include:

**Fritz Schneider**, serving as ISC Chair and subject expert for the Feed & Forages flagship. Fritz is a Swiss national and an independent livestock systems consultant, currently serving as Chair of the Global Agenda for Sustainable Livestock. Trained in Animal Science at ETH (Switzerland) and University of British Columbia (Canada), he had a career in higher education management and was the Head of Agriculture at the Bern University of Applied Sciences (HAFL). He has wide international experience as a consultant.

**Heather Burrow**, serving as subject expert for the Livestock Genetics flagship. Heather, an Australian citizen, has had a 40-year career as a quantitative geneticist and business professional in various aspects of managing and implementing beef research in Australia, including the Beef CRC. More recently, she has worked with the University of New England, including serving as Director of Research Partnerships and Innovation at the Institute for Rural Futures and leader of a major ACIAR-funded project to improve the beef value chain in South Africa. She also serves on the Steering Committee of the Centre for Tropical Livestock Genetics and Health of which ILRI is a partner.

**Muhammad Ibrahim**, serving as subject expert for the Livestock & the Environment flagship. Muhammad is a Guyana national and is the Director General of CATIE, the lead agricultural research institute for Central America. He trained in agriculture and environmental sciences with an emphasis on animal nutrition at CATIE and Wageningen. He has led the livestock and environmental management research program at CATIE and also served as a country representative and program manager at IICA.

**Lorne Babiuk**, serving as subject expert for the Livestock Health flagship. Lorne, a Canadian, is a virologist and until recently the Vice-President of Research at the University of Alberta (Canada). He has had a long and distinguished academic career that has contributed to over 40 patents related to veterinary vaccines. Lorne has previously served as a member of the ILRI Board

The current members support the inclusion of an additional member with strong expertise in social sciences and/or livestock systems economics.

The ISC assigns specific tasks to the individual members. The members will focus on the assigned Flagships and will act as sounding board for the Flagship leaders:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Flagship** | **Specific tasks for** |
| Livestock Genetics | Heather & Lorne |
| Livestock Feed & Forages | Muhammad & Fritz |
| Livestock Health | Lorne & Heather & Social scientist (vacant) |
| Livestock and the Environment | Muhammad & Fritz |
| Livestock Livelihoods and Agri-Food Systems | Heather & Social scientist (vacant) |

1. **Orientation Sessions and Face to Face Meeting**

**4.1 Orientation Sessions**

The ISC has started its work with four virtual orientation sessions:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Nr.** | **Date** | **Topic** |
| 1 | 19 Oct.2017 | Introduction to the Livestock CRP |
| 2 | 7 Nov. 2017 | The CGIAR System Context |
| 3 | 15 Nov. 2017 | Theories of Change and Results Based Management in the CRP Livestock |
| 4 | 6 Dec. 2017 | CRP planning and reporting cycle, cross-cutting themes and priority countries |

These very useful sessions introduced the ISC members step by step into the complexities of the CRP. The sessions were instrumental in preparing the ISC members for the face to face meeting in Nairobi.

The presentations will remain valuable reference documents for the future work of the ISC.

**4.2 Face to Face Meeting in Nairobi, 12 to 14 December 2017**

The first face to face meeting of the ISC took place at ILRI in Nairobi from 12 to 14 December.

The agenda is shown in annex 1.

The first half day was dedicated to discussions with the CRP leader (Tom Randolph), including an initial session with ILRI management. The ISC discussed and agreed on the Terms of Reference and received an overview of the strategy, progress and plans. This was followed by detailed presentations by the Flagship leaders and the responsible persons for the crosscutting issues. Based on these deliberations the ISC discussed and recorded its observations and agreed on few, very specific recommendations as reported below.

1. **Observations and Recommendations at CRP Level**

**5.1 Observations**

1. We have been impressed with the level of support and information as well as the professionalism and responsiveness demonstrated by CRP management; this includes providing visionary leadership and direction to the overall program
2. We also recognize the flagship leaders’ commitment and passion in supporting and directing their flagships
3. Not unexpectedly, the CRP is a very complex beast!
4. The Theory of Change is not sufficiently understood and therefore not sufficiently owned by the Flagship Leaders (but we also recognise that implementation of theory of change is a work in progress, with most other organisations worldwide also struggling with achieving such change)
5. We strongly endorse the concept that flagship leaders are **leaders** not just managers and coordinators
6. The funding model creates major challenges e.g.

* CRP Management does not necessarily have any control or leverage over bi-lateral flagship funding and hence no or little control over a large sum of the budget and strategic research directions
* Funding does not come in until the end of the year and hence it is difficult to forward-plan
* Annual budgeting (particularly in retrospect) for long-term activities is difficult

1. Scarce W1/W2 funding creates challenges particularly on the research funding and for development of management tools (e.g. M&E, Capacity Development)
2. However the ready availability of W3 funding provides good operating funding for flagship activities which the donors are prepared to fund (i.e. around 50% of overall funding is for salaries with the remainder available for research operating)
3. The CGIAR system has a global (developing country) focus whereas the CRP has a very strong focus on African countries
4. Researchers may have torn accountabilities between CRP strategic directions and those imposed by their bilateral funding
5. The balance between fundamental/discovery research and development activities needs to have particular attention as the programs move forward (i.e. each flagship should have a balanced mix of both)
6. Consideration should be given to the inclusion of research on methods to achieve effective scaling out (in addition to scaling out activities per sé)
7. Each flagship should prioritise the activities within each cluster to maximise opportunities when additional funding becomes available or funding cuts are experienced
8. We appreciate how the entire CRP has embraced the cross-cutting issues and applied innovative thinking to develop new tools and approaches – this provides confidence that the CRP will be successful in these areas
9. We believe that over time, linkages between other CRPs will become increasingly valuable, but currently such linkages are not visible
10. We would appreciate development of a reporting framework capturing baseline performance and ongoing progress

**5.2 Recommendations at CRP Level**

1. More work needs to be done to demonstrate the importance and value of theory of change throughout the programme.
2. CRP Management should ensure the reporting requirements and framework for reporting are reasonable (e.g. in terms of time and benefit to the system level in achieving compliance - i.e. cost: benefit – applies to ISC as well!)
3. The CRP needs to position itself in a globally competitive landscape and this needs to be made visible (as well as demonstrating synergies with additional potential partners)[[1]](#footnote-1)
4. **Observations and Recommendations at Livestock Genetics Flagship Level**

**6.1 Observations**

1. We recognise good achievements in the genetics flagship (e.g. through high-quality scientific papers) which will form the foundation on which this flagship can build
2. There appeared to be a significant disparity between the written report (which focused almost entirely on research outputs) and the presentation, which focused most strongly on deliverables
3. We were impressed with the partnerships that have been developed and the bilateral funding which has been achieved by this flagship
4. We were particularly impressed with the novel approach to establishing a genetic improvement program for small ruminants, which is an area where most countries globally have struggled
5. At the scientific level, we observed a disproportionate reliance on genomic information to draw conclusions, often in the complete absence of phenotypic information – but we also note the intent in the forward planning to increase data collection for important traits
6. The focus of the poultry research appears to be strongly on improving productivity and feed demands with no emphasis on feed efficiency, with implications for feed demand
7. There appears to be very high reliance on a single major donor which is driving research directions – this has implications for sustainability
8. It became clear during this presentation that researchers may have difficulties when they present to donors expecting to hear progress just with activities funded by them whereas in practice the research team does not differentiate source of funding (e.g. CTLGH IAC was critical of the genetics presentation at its last meeting on the basis that the program was claiming credit for progress in the ADGG and ACGG projects but had not yet made good progress with activities funded by CTLGH)

**6.2 Recommendations**

1. It is recommended that in future, the written report and verbal presentation be more closely aligned, with a strong focus on the ‘product lines’ and aligned with the CRP template for reporting
2. We encourage the flagship to strongly integrate phenotypic with genomic information to better interpret the implications for end users
3. Consideration should be given to measuring feed efficiency in backyard poultry in addition to the stated focus on growth rates and number of eggs
4. **Observations at Livestock Feed & Forages Flagship Level**

**7.1 Observations**

1. The flagship builds on a very long and successful track record of achievements in feed and forages research and development
2. We were impressed by the substantial amount of bilateral funding that has been achieved by this flagship
3. We were concerned about the very large number of activities, each of which must be receiving relatively small amounts of funding
4. The achievements in feed and forages have largely been derived in Latin America but challenges remain about how to capitalize on the progress in other continents.
5. We are concerned that some aspects of the research may be duplicating similar efforts being undertaken by other organisations such as CSIRO, EMBRAPA, Global Research-Alliance-NZ etc.
6. There appears to be a very weak link between feed and forages research and nutrition, and rangeland management
7. We recognise the importance of the forthcoming face-to-face meeting for this flagship to assist in strengthening the focus on aspects of theory of change which is in progress

**7.2 Recommendations**

1. We recommend that the flagship focuses on a number of key product lines for impact
2. We recommend that the flagship makes greater efforts to deliver in other jurisdictions in addition to Latin America. The flagship should conduct a study to determine what are the enabling conditions that promoted the adoption of improved forage technologies in Latin America and how the information can be used for implementation in Africa
3. We recommend that the flagship positions itself within the global landscape of feeds and forages research
4. **Observations at Livestock Livelihoods & Agri-Food Systems Flagship Level**

**8.1 Observations**

1. This flagship builds on a very long and successful track record of achievements in the very broad range of disciplines addressed in its portfolio
2. Many of the activities in this flagship are now being successfully developed for delivery
3. The flagship has a strong focus on value chains which could then be leveraged to provide more visibility for livestock agri-food systems
4. We commend the flagship for their successful integration of the crosscutting issues with both the flagship clusters and the other CRP flagships
5. The flagship has taken a very pro-active approach in integrating the private sector actors and this is also commended
6. How will the flagship know how well they are delivering against their ‘targets to 2022’?

**8.2 Recommendations**

1. We recommend the flagship gives some emphasis to livestock agri-food systems where there are no existing markets (in backyard poultry systems for example) and to look at the resilience of the agri-food systems with different risk factors
2. We recommend the flagship develops a reasonable reporting framework that will allow it to demonstrate how it is delivering against its ‘targets to 2022’
3. **Observations at the Livestock and the Environment Flagship Level**

**9.1 Observations**

1. This flagship has very strong linkages between environment, gender and youth, thereby generating new opportunities for the flagship in creating practice change benefitting the environment
2. This should be a critical component of all of the flagships and yet there appears to be insufficient funding to undertake the work that is needed across those other flagships (see also under cross cutting issues)
3. We are concerned that some aspects of the research may be duplicating similar efforts being undertaken by other organisations. For example the Livestock working group of the GRA defined three flagships working on themes related to emissions and carbon sequestration. This livestock and environment flagship should try to work with the forage flagship and the GRA to develop emission factors for tropical forages and feeds which the countries need to develop their baseline and monitoring of NDCs- livestock
4. We would like to see a stronger emphasis on the economics of ’green accounting’ (to produce evidence for banks and the private sector to invest in climate-smart and environmentally friendly livestock practices)
5. As presented, there appears to be a small focus on scaling out and primarily in a limited number of Africa countries. E.g. useful experiences from Latin America could be adapted to African countries.
6. We believe there should be a regional-level (as well as national) focus to policy development

**9.2 Recommendations**

1. We recommend that there be an analysis of where additional funding for this type of research might be available – for example economics of ‘green accounting’; additionally there could be cross-talk between this flagship and other flagships around the possibility of pooling resources or enhancing funding opportunities for research in this area
2. We recommend that the flagship positions itself within the global landscape of livestock and environment research
3. We recommend that greater effort be made in undertaking scaling out across wider regional areas and including a regional level focus to policy development
4. **Observations at Health Flagship Level**

**10.1 Observations**

1. We commend the flagship leader on a well-constructed presentation, breaking down several complex sections (particularly theory of change) into easily understood points - we were also very impressed with the level of openness in discussing challenges faced by the flagship (many of them relevant for the entire CRP)
2. This flagship is building on decades of fundamental research which we hope will come to fruition in the foreseeable future (e.g. ECF and herd health which have been underway without delivery for many years)
3. The flagship is giving good attention to building trust amongst its partners (e.g. by not reducing funds to them when other parts of the project are receiving funding cuts)
4. Reporting is particularly difficult in this flagship because many of the projects have long-term goals and results need to be kept confidential – we would be keen to see some thought given as to how for example annual reporting of progress could be achieved (even if such reporting needs to be on a strictly confidential basis)

**10.2 Recommendations**

1. We recommend that the flagship develops a more robust annual reporting framework to measure progress on long-term / confidential projects
2. **Observations on Cross-cutting Issues**

**11.1 Observations**

1. We are comfortable that each of the flagships is paying attention to the cross-cutting issues
2. All of the cross-cutting issues are being addressed in a very professional manner, with a strong willingness to support the flagships even though their issues and efforts may not be ‘highlighted’ as part of flagship reporting
3. It appears that all of the cross-cutting issues may be suffering because funding for these issues only comes from W1/W2 funding (i.e. the bilateral funding organisations are less prepared to fund efforts around these issues)
4. We commend the degree of innovation demonstrated in development of the tools used to address these cross-cutting issues

**11.2 Recommendations**

1. We recommend that CRP Management address the need for additional, external funding for cross-cutting activities; additionally, there could be discussions between the cross-cutting issues team and the flagships around the possibility of pooling resources or enhancing funding opportunities for activities in this area
2. **Business Meetings** 
   1. **Meeting with the CRP Management Committee**

The ISC presented its preliminary findings in terms of observations and a few recommendations at the CRP, flagship and cross-cutting issue level. The presentation was followed with a constructive discussion, showing that both observations and recommendations have been appreciated. The linking of individual ISC members to specific flagships has been welcomed by the Management committee. It was decided that direct correspondence between ISC members and flagship leaders is ok, however the ISC Chair and the CRP director should be copied in the correspondence.

* 1. **Wrap up meeting with CRP Leader and ILRI Management, next steps**

The meeting briefly looked back on the three days’ deliberations. ILRI Management and CRP Director expressed their appreciation of the ISC work. The ISC expressed appreciation in terms of meeting preparation, presentations and discussions.

For 2018, the following ISC activities have been sketched (subject to further planning and confirmation of dates, meeting places and agenda)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Dates (approx.)** | **Content** | **Meeting place** |
| Feb. 2018 | Circulation of draft annual reports of the Flagships and CRP consolidated | Virtual, input by correspondence, CRP Director and ISC virtual discussions |
| April-May 2018 | ? | Face to Face, place open, possibly connected with project visits |
| 17 to 21 September 2018 | Draft of POWB, assessment of progress | Face to Face, probably ILRI Nairobi |
| 20 to 24 October 2018 | Report of the ISC Chair to the ILRI Board | Virtual |

1. **Final Remarks**

The objectives of the first meeting of the ISC were:

* To get to know each other and to agree on the Terms of Reference of the ISC
* To get an overview of the CRP and identify strengths and weaknesses
* To create a baseline for the ISC for its further work

The ISC is confident that these objectives have been achieved during the meeting under report. The ISC now has a good base to continue its work. The recommendations will form part of a reference frame for the next meetings.

Elements needing further analyses and discussions with others are:

* The positioning of the Flagships within their respective global research landscape
* A closer look at the governance structure. It might be useful to institutionalize a platform for the Flagship leaders and cross cutting issue coordinators to discuss progress and learn from each other.
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**Annex 1: Meeting of ISC Chair with the Director General of ILRI,   
 15 December 2017 (0930 h)**

Jimmy Smith thanks the ISC team for the in-depth analysis with many important insights for the CRP but also for its position within the entire ILRI programme. Below some selected discussion elements.

***Observation:*** *The CGIAR system has a global (developing country) focus whereas the CRP has a very strong focus on African countries.*

Jimmy is aware that ILRI focuses a lot on Africa. At the same time he observes that it is difficult for ILRI to get a strong foothold e.g. in Asia. ILRI is seen as an institution working mostly in and for Africa. Nevertheless ILRI is making efforts to be present in other continents. In that sense the ISC comment will help to push for a stronger presence. The efforts of CRP and ISC in this direction are welcome.

***Recommendation:*** *The CRP needs to position itself in a globally competitive landscape and this needs to be made visible (as well as demonstrating synergies with additional potential partners).*

Jimmy is very happy with this recommendation. He fully agrees with us that the positioning of the CRP flagships in the respective thematic research landscape is important. He is of the opinion that this positioning is not given enough importance in the entire ILRI program and probably in the entire CG system. He appreciates the ISC recommendation in this regard, the CRP could/should take the lead in this aspect.

***Observation:*** *The balance between fundamental/discovery research and development activities needs to have particular attention as the programs move forward (i.e. each flagship should have a balanced mix of both).*

***Observation FF FP:*** *We were concerned about the very large number of activities each of which must be receiving relatively small amounts of funding*

Jimmy states that both observations are true and are concerns to him as well. He encourages the ISC to think about developing (or: support a process to develop) a set of criteria a project has to fulfill to be mapped to a CRP flagship (content / research-development balance / size / donor).

**Annex 2: Meeting of the ISC Chair with the Assistant Director General of ILRI,   
 15 December 2017, 1100 h**

As Shirley was present in the CRP management meeting as well as in the wrap up meeting, the discussion focused mostly on the position of the CRP within the entire ILRI programme.

**Relationship between ILRI programme and the Livestock CRP**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | All of the CRP flagships are well embedded in important ILRI research areas.  For the ISC it will be important to better understand the relationship between the entire ILRI programme and the CRP. |

**The Livestock CRP within the ILRI Governance Structure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | This slide illustrates the institutional positioning of the Livestock CRP within the ILRI governance structure.  The CRP Director Tom Randolph is reporting directly to the Director General of ILRI |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | This slide illustrates the fact, (discussed throughout the meeting) that W1/W2 funding is decreasing since 2015.  In some way defeating the strategy to provide flexible funding to the CGIAR programmes. |

**Annex 3: Meeting agenda**

**CGIAR Research Program on Livestock Agri-Food Systems**

**1st Meeting of the Independent Steering Committee**

**Nairobi, 12-14 December 2017.**

**AGENDA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Monday, 11 December | | |
|  | Arrival |  |
| Tuesday, 12 December (Note: Bank Holiday in Kenya) | | |
| 8:30-9:45 | ‘Business meeting’ with CRP and ILRI management   * Welcome and introductions * Review of roles and responsibilities * Brief update on System and CRP developments * Any administrative issues |  |
| 9:45-10:00 | Coffee |  |
| 10:00-11:00 | Internal committee discussion on its approach to reviewing CRP progress and plans |  |
| 11:00-12:30 | At the CRP level: strategy, progress and plans | Tom Randolph |
| 12:30-13:00 | Open |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch |  |
| 14:00-15:30 | Flagship 1: strategy, progress and plans | Olivier Hanotte |
| 15:30-15:45 | Coffee |  |
| 15:45-17:15 | Flagship 2: strategy, progress and plans | Michael Peters |
| Wednesday, 13 December | | |
| 8:30-9:00 | Reflection on Day 1 |  |
| 9:00-10:30 | Flagship 3: strategy, progress and plans | Steve Staal |
| 10:30-10:45 | Coffee |  |
| 10:45-12:15 | Flagship 4: strategy, progress and plans | Polly Ericksen |
| 12:15-13:00 | Gender | Nicoline de Haan |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch |  |
| 14:00-15:30 | Flagship 5: strategy, progress and plans | Ulf Magnusson |
| 15:30-15:45 | Coffee |  |
| 15:45-16:45 | Performance management, M&E and research quality | Helen Altshul,  Jane Poole |
| 16:45-17:30 | Capacity development | Iddo Dror |
| Thursday, 14 December | | |
| 8:30-13:00 | Committee deliberations (follow-up meetings with researchers?) |  |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch |  |
| 14:00-15:30 | Joint session with the CRP Management Committee (and ILRI management)   * Preliminary feedback about ISC role and responsibilities * Preliminary feedback from review of the CRP and flagships * Discussion points for the Management Committee |  |
| 15:30-15:45 | Coffee |  |
| 15:45-16:30 | Committee deliberations and wrap-up   * Next steps * Dates for next meeting |  |
| 16:30-17:30 | * Wrap-up with ILRI Management and Evaluation |  |
|  | Departures |  |
| Friday, 15 December (only Chair ISC) | | |
| 9:30-11:00 | Meeting ISC Chair with Director General ILRI | Fritz Schneider  Jimmy Smith |
| 11:00-12:30 | Meeting ISC Chair with Assistant Director General | Fritz Schneider  Shirley Tarawali |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch |  |
| 1630 | Departure | Fritz Schneider |

1. The ISC would like to better understand the positioning of the CRP research at flagship level within the specific global research landscape. For example the research of the livestock feeds and forages flagship (see 7.1/5) or the livestock and the environment flagship vis à vis the research of the livestock group of the GRA (see 9.1/3) or the livestock health flagship vis à vis the work being done by FAO and OIE. By this transparent positioning the flagships will be better able to convincingly show why their research is unique, relevant and important for sustainable livestock sector development. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)